

**REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner rejected claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,589,947 to Sato et al. ("Sato").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Sato.

The finality of the Office Action is improper. Applicant requests withdrawal of its finality, since the Examiner did not rebut or answer any of Applicant's previous arguments.

As stated in M.P.E.P. § 706.07, "where a single previous Office action contains a complete statement of a ground of rejection, the final rejection may refer to such a statement and also *should include a rebuttal of any arguments raised in the applicant's reply*" (emphasis added). Additionally, M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f) states: "[w]here the applicant traverses any rejection, *the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it*" (emphasis added).

In the present case, the Examiner has not addressed any of Applicant's previous arguments that expose the deficiencies of the cited reference. Therefore, at minimum, the Examiner should address all of Applicant's arguments in the next Office Action if any of the claims still stand rejected.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner cited to paragraphs 0007, 0039, 0041, and 0043 of *Sato*. However, it is not clear how the Examiner numbered the paragraphs of *Sato* because no paragraph numbers are listed in the reference. It is unclear if the Examiner counted the headings in the reference as separate paragraphs. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner cite to the specific column and line number(s) of *Sato* that allegedly disclose the claimed elements. Applicant has attempted to locate the specific paragraphs cited by the Examiner, but Applicant submits that a thorough reading of *Sato* reveals a lack of disclosure regarding several claim elements.

Claim 7 recites an apparatus including, for example:

...  
a request means for requesting, from the first information processing apparatus, address information of a second information processing apparatus connected to the first information processing apparatus via a network;

...  
an acquisition means for acquiring first operation screen information for displaying a first operation screen corresponding to the first information processing apparatus and second operation screen information for displaying a second operation screen corresponding to the second information processing apparatus; and

a display means for displaying the first operation screen and the second operation screen, wherein

the control means controls the second information processing apparatus via the first information processing apparatus based on the address information.

(emphasis added). *Sato* does not disclose the claimed “request means,” “acquisition means,” “display means,” and “control means.”

*Sato* discloses a karaoke system. The karaoke system includes a CCTV center system 100 that receives requests from terminal systems R1 and R2. Based on the

requests, CCTV center system 100 may transmit "signals of music pieces to be played and relevant video images to the terminal systems R1, R2" (col. 1, lines 38-39).

*Sato* does not teach or suggest an apparatus that includes "a request means for requesting, from the first information processing apparatus, address information of a second information processing apparatus connected to the first information processing apparatus via a network," as recited in claim 7. CCTV center system 100 does not request, from terminal system R1, "address information" of terminal system R2.

In addition, CCTV center system 100 does not acquire and display screen information received from terminal systems R1 and R2. Accordingly, *Sato* does not teach or suggest "an acquisition means for acquiring first operation screen information for displaying a first operation screen corresponding to the first information processing apparatus and second operation screen information for displaying a second operation screen corresponding to the second information processing apparatus" and "a display means for displaying the first operation screen and the second operation screen," as recited in claim 7.

Moreover, CCTV center system 100 does not control terminal system R2 via terminal system R1. Therefore, *Sato* also does not teach or suggest "the control means controls the second information processing apparatus via the first information processing apparatus based on the address information," as further recited in claim 7.

*Sato* fails to anticipate claim 7, and claim 7 is allowable. Claim 8 is also allowable at least due to its depending from claim 7. Independent claims 9 and 10 are allowable over *Sato* for at least the same reasons discussed above in regard to claim 7.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 27, 2009

By: /David W. Hill/  
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220